

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. Claims 1-15 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding claim 1, the applicant submitted that Walton discloses that the preamble contained in the RACH PDU is sent over in the RACH, such that a user terminal first processes the BCH to obtain signaling parameters and proceeds with the transmission of the preamble on the same channel of the RACH PDU in the Radio Access Channel. The examiner agrees with the point made by the applicant and submits that in view of current amendments entered on 07/10/2009, claim 1 is distinguished from Walton's reference. As is known in the art, synchronization for signaling uplink requests to the base station involves sending bursts in the Random Access Channel, the preamble is sent traditionally over this channel, but not on a different channel. In the same field of endeavor, the examiner presents references in which the preamble channel is no different than the RACH. For example in Narvinger et al (US Patent 6,381,229), it is disclosed that the uplink frame is divided into preamble portion and data portion transmitted in Random Access Channel (See abstract). Wang et al (USPPA 2004/026449) similarly teaches transmitting the preamble in the RACH (See figure 1). The examiner searched the subclasses as indicated in the search notes, and found references that treat similarly preamble synchronization for assignment of dedicated data channels or allocation of uplink/downlink resources however, the

references fail to explicitly disclose "...data transmission channel over which the random access data is transmitted from the mobile station to the base station is different from the preamble transmission channel over which the preamble is transmitted from the mobile station to the base station". A reference by Pihlaja et al (USPPA 2008/025433) appears to partially read on claim 1 limitation (See abstract and [0029] lines 13-14), however, the reference does not anticipate the date of the claimed invention. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 directly or indirectly and therefore for the reasons presented above, claims 2-3 are allowed.

Claims 4, 10, and 13 contain similar features as in claim 1 and therefore are allowed.

Claims 5-9, 11-12, and 14-15 depend from claims 4, 10, and 13 respectively and carry all the limitations of their respective independent claims either directly or indirectly, therefore said claims 5-9, 11-12, and 14-15 are allowed.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISSAM CHAKOUR whose telephone number is (571) 270-5889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Perez Rafael can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/I. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617